



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sented with singular intensity of thought and stainless purity of feeling. Indeed, the relation of mother and child, in numerous pieces in the volume, is surrounded with so many holy images, and enveloped in such an atmosphere of tenderness and love, that the only proper criticism on the felicity of its treatment would be a throng of quotations for which we have no space. There is also a number of descriptive poems, displaying a fine cheerful play and interchange of fancy and sentiment, which relieve the general tone of serious thought by which the collection is characterized. In leaving a volume laden with so many pure thoughts and sacred emotions, unstained by one compromise with passion, and consecrated with such singleness of heart to the highest objects, we cannot but hope it will receive a cordial recognition wherever poetry has a welcome, affection a home, and religion a worshipper.

---

## ART. XI. — CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *A Letter to the President of Harvard College.* By A MEMBER OF THE CORPORATION. Boston: Little & Brown. 1849. 8vo. pp. 53.

WE are sorry to have the evidence which this pamphlet affords, that the article in our last number upon the affairs of Harvard College has been greatly misapprehended. Our chief object in writing it was to induce the legislature to appropriate a large sum from the revenues of the State to meet the urgent wants of the institution, and to show the propriety of devoting this fund, if it should be obtained, exclusively to the undergraduate department, or the college proper, — the main trunk which has recently shot out into many branches. So large a portion of the article was obviously intended to have this effect, that it never occurred to us that the friendly purpose of the whole could be called in question. This purpose is avowed in the article itself; at the close of that portion of it which, as we find, appears to some persons to be animated by a hostile or censorious spirit, we observed “Our object all along has been to set forth the wants of Harvard College proper, and its claims upon the public for patronage and support.” Our argument in favor of a State grant begins by

showing, that the State thus far has given much less than individuals, and though the college has nominally received, from one source or another, nearly a million of dollars since 1800, yet the money has been given in such a manner, and for such purposes, that aid from the legislature is still needed in order to open the doors of the institution to a larger number of students, and thus to foster the cause of liberal studies, and to spread the generous influences of them broadcast over the whole community. We proved that most of this money did not really belong to the college proper, and could not be devoted to the support of "liberal studies," — that though the objects to which it is devoted are of great interest and importance, deserving of all encouragement in their place, they have but a remote affinity to the peculiar pursuits of a college, and, in fact, tend to interfere with them, and push them aside, when they are united under the same management.

We have no controversy, then, with the writer of this pamphlet. He is a jealous defender of the reputation and the claims of Harvard College, and ardently desires to extend and perpetuate its usefulness; we not only wish him all success, but have endeavored to be his companion and assistant in the endeavor. He argues with much earnestness, that the Corporation did right in accepting the various donations for Christianizing the Indians, founding Farm Schools, Scientific Schools, Observatories, and the like. Very well; who doubts it? There is not a word in our article which implies that these donations ought to have been rejected. But what then? Can we not, consistently, attempt to persuade munificent individuals and the legislature, when they are disposed to assist Harvard College, to give their money rather to poor students and the undergraduate department, than to Indians, Farm Schools, and "special students in chemistry?" Can we not prove, that though it is a great and good work to found an Observatory, and the Corporation did quite right to help it onward, if their aid was needed, yet Harvard College and the students in it are not — at least, not directly, — the better off for this establishment, and that, just at the present time, "liberal studies" stand more in need of sympathy and support than astronomical studies? Persons who have just subscribed, to the full extent of their means, in order to buy a great Equatorial, will not be so willing, the next day, to give an equally liberal sum to buy books for the library, or to found scholarships with; they will be likely to answer, "Why, I gave Harvard College \$1,000 only yesterday." To this, it was quite pertinent for us to reply, as we did, that, in giving their money to found an Observatory, they did not give it to Harvard College, which had also contri-

buted in its own way — and very largely, too — to the Observatory, and now stood in urgent need of aid for itself.

The writer of this pamphlet imputes to us an intention to blame the Corporation for accepting Daniel Williams's gift, now constituting a fund of more than \$15,000, to be applied to the conversion of North American Indians. Certainly, it would require the perverse ingenuity of a fault-finding spirit to censure the institution for the mistaken proceedings of those who have been in their graves for at least a century. But it was not our object to censure, or even to criticize, the measures of the Corporation of 1716, or of the Corporation of 1849. We did not intend to blame either for accepting gifts that were offered to them; the common sense of mankind would pronounce such a charge to be very unreasonable. But we wished to warn the legislature against supposing that the college was rich, and therefore needed no aid, because nominally it held \$750,000 of active funds. For this purpose, we dissected this fund, and taking the most striking instances first, we showed that the College was none the richer for the Williams or the Winslow donation, because the one really belonged to the Indians, and the other to the good town of Tyngsborough. Suppose the memorial of the Colleges for aid to be actually under consideration in the legislature; some economical member might rise and say, — 'Mr. Speaker, *Harvard* certainly needs no aid; her last treasury report shows that her income-producing property amounts to \$750,000; Mr. Bussey has recently left her an estate worth \$350,000; Mr. Lawrence the other day gave her \$50,000; Edward B. Phillips left her \$100,000; she has recently built and furnished an Observatory at the cost of \$70,000. In short, she is as rich as Cræsus, and I won't vote for the State to give her a dollar.'

"A member of the Corporation" thinks that if a person can reason in this manner, "he must be one whom it would be more difficult than useful to enlighten." But we have known sillier arguments than these to have great effect in a legislative body, when the ostensible object was to save the people's money. In our article, then, we supposed that this member might be thus answered: — 'My good friend, you mistake; those \$750,000 do not belong to Harvard, but to the Indians, to the town of Tyngsborough — to Farm Schools, to Observatories, to — the Lord knows what, — to outlying establishments which have 'as much to do with the original purpose for which the College was founded as with' — any thing else.'

The article does not consist of two parts which are contradictory and inconsistent, but is animated by one spirit and intention from beginning to end, and that one friendly to the College.

The writer of this pamphlet couples our remark, that certain things "give a rude shock to our feelings of affectionate admiration for our *Alma Mater*," with the whole "series of statements" in the article, thus making it appear as if we had confessed that the effect of the article, as a whole, would be to lower the institution in public esteem. But this is a mistake; the remark occurs in the early part of the article, on page 105; it refers only to the observations which precede and justify it, and which this writer has not controverted. He sanctions by implication, also, the plan for founding scholarships, which it was our chief object to explain and recommend; for he says, that if the reviewer had contented himself "with advocating the plan for a remedy of the evil [the great expense of living as a student at Cambridge,] which he has ably discussed in the last pages of his article, the College would have had substantial reasons to be grateful to him for his valuable aid." Now we believe, — and if we did any justice to our own intentions, we are sure, — that there is not a paragraph or a sentence in the article, which has not a bearing more or less direct upon the furtherance of this project. We do not object to this jealous regard for the reputation of Harvard; we sympathize with it entirely. We only ask this writer to believe, that there are others who feel as deep an interest as himself in her welfare and good name, though they may pursue a different line of argument in advocating her claims upon the generosity of individuals and the patronage of the State.

We did not depreciate the character and objects of the various institutions that have recently been added to the college, but spoke of them in the strongest terms of eulogy that we could command, as entitled to "the admiration and support of every well-informed lover of his race, every well-wisher to the highest interests of mankind." But it was argued, that the college had contributed so liberally from its own means for the promotion of these objects, as to lessen materially its power of continuing to advantage the peculiar work, the advancement and diffusion of "liberal studies," for which it was first instituted, so that it has now a claim to gratitude and aid from the particular friends of those other pursuits which it has so generously encouraged. We represented that Harvard had given its lands, its funds, its chartered powers, its professors, the valuable time and services of its president, treasurer, fellows, and other officers, to these outlying institutions, which have no just claim upon it, since their functions and purposes are foreign to its own; and that it was ungenerous to ask it to do more. It has now a right to expect assistance from individuals and the State for itself. Have not these statements and arguments an obvious bearing upon the furtherance of that pro-

ject, the establishment of scholarships, which seems to have the hearty approval of "a member of the Corporation?"

This writer censures our remark, that these outlying establishments "absorb the time and energy of the governors of the college;" he insists that the word *absorb* must mean to "take up all," or "an undue proportion of," a thing. We supposed that it also meant to *imbibe*, or *take up a part of*, and it was in this sense that we used it; it is usual to say, that a sponge *absorbs* water, but we do not thereby mean that it will suck dry the Atlantic, or even diminish appreciably the depth of water on the Grand Bank. We intended to say, that these Farm Schools, Tyngsborough schoolmasters, &c., necessarily *take up a part of* the time and attention of the Corporation, the members of which must feel that the cares and responsibility of managing the college alone formed no light task, as their services are given gratuitously; that it was therefore unreasonable to throw upon them other burdens, which, in the end, if not at present, would cause the college to suffer, because it could no longer receive the *undivided* attention of its President and Fellows.

The members of the Corporation are nowhere alluded to in the article but in terms of courtesy and the highest respect. We spoke of this board as "composed of a few gentlemen of the very highest repute for learning, ability, and uprightness," so that testators were inclined to leave them funds in trust for purposes which had nothing to do with the college, and ought not to be committed to the management of its officers. After noticing some instances of the waste or misapplication of funds by other corporations, we remarked that "Harvard College takes better care of the money intrusted to her, and faithfully applies it to any purpose the testator may indicate." Is there any thing like detraction or censoriousness in this remark? Is it even conceivable that the President and Fellows should be blamed, because testators—without consulting them, and often, probably, in opposition to their wishes—sometimes make very foolish wills, and leave them funds in trust, whether their object be to "endow a college or a cat?" In the way of playful exaggeration, it was added, that if any body should leave a cotton-mill in charge of the Corporation, we had no doubt the trust would be faithfully executed, and the spindles duly made to turn "for centuries to come." Perhaps this illustration was not in good taste, but there was certainly no ill-nature in it; if the possibility of its giving offence had been suggested, we would have used grist-mill, or saw-mill, which would have answered the purpose equally well. We do not belong to that small school of political philanthropists, who invented the noted alliterative antithesis of "cotton

and conscience," and we have no occasion to borrow their poor jeers and small wit.

The writer censures our statement, that the college is "poorer, weaker, and less efficient than it was many years ago," while only a few pages before, he makes almost the same assertion, in this strong language: — "Yes, I say again, — and I wish to impress the true meaning of the word, and the true causes of the fact, if I can, upon the mind of every reader, — Harvard College is very poor, and is compelled to be a beggar for those necessaries of life, which, if it had been rich, would have been furnished long ago." If *we* had called Harvard College "a beggar," the writer would probably have emptied the vials of righteous indignation upon our head, and have accused us of doing nothing "to strengthen the faith of the friends of the college in its stability and progress." But we do not impute to him any sarcastic or hostile purpose in applying this opprobrious name to the college. When soliciting aid for the seminary, it is necessary to show that the aid is needed; and *for this purpose* one may be permitted to prove that it is not so rich, strong, and efficient as it ought to be, without thereby subjecting himself to any just charge of hostility to the institution. We ask this writer to interpret our language under the presumption that he doubtless expects will be applied to his own, — that it comes from an undoubted and ardent friend of old Harvard, who is laboring only to further her interests, though his expressions may chance to be indiscreet. When, from excess of caution, as most persons would suppose, on pointing out those wants and deficiencies of the college, which, in the language of this writer, have "compelled it to be a beggar for the necessaries of life," we went out of our way to say that the Corporation were not responsible for them — that they could "all be easily accounted for without imputing blame to any one," that they were facts but not faults, — must this declaration be regarded as a stabbing under the fifth rib while the assassin is uttering professions of friendship, or as intended to cast the censure which it disavows and protests against? He says, "from the very *significant* way in which [the reviewer] enumerates them, one almost inevitably infers . . . that in his judgment they are not only facts, but faults; and that if the college had been rightly managed, they would not have existed." Now, in all sincerity, and with perfect respect, we submit that this is not judging as he himself *must* be judged, if his own language is to show that he is a friend to the college.

Having no wish to prolong a discussion with any undoubted friend of Harvard, we pass over entirely one or two minor points, on which this writer thinks that the correctness of our statements

may be questioned, though we believe that their fairness and accuracy could be amply and easily vindicated. Let any unbiased reader, even if he should think that these charges of inaccuracy were substantiated, peruse the last eight pages of our article, and say if they are animated by a carping and censorious spirit towards the institution. It is very possible that the vivacity of some expressions in the former part of the article may have led some persons to misjudge our intentions; when pleading the cause of a friend, we do not hesitate and weigh our language very cautiously; but we certainly do not expect that this friend himself will misinterpret it, and then turn and rend us. Let the article be viewed as a whole, before the purpose with which it is written is declared to be manifest; when this is done, we will gladly abandon single sentences and rhetorical exaggerations in it to the severest criticism of "a member of the Corporation." We are sure that all the friends of Harvard will agree, that the institution ought to court discussion and criticism, for it is able to bear them. The more light and air, the greater the health. We believe that the time has come, when the establishment of a considerable number of scholarships in it is essential to the continuance of its prosperity, its usefulness, and its good name. What it now most needs is *more students*, — not so much new museums, new observatories, new laboratories, or even new professors of distinguished reputation, with but few pupils to profit by their instructions. It was founded as a place of *education*, not as an institute for the advancement of physical science. Young scholars, well trained for all the offices both of public and private life, are its appropriate products, its brightest ornaments, and its surest defence.

---

2. *The Life of Major-General Peter Muhlenberg, of the Revolutionary Army.* By HENRY A. MUHLENBERG. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1849. 12mo. pp. 456.

"It is a pious duty," says the writer of this book, in his opening sentence, "to rescue the memory of the great and good men who achieved our independence from that oblivion into which it is fast falling." This duty ere long will be pretty fully executed. Almost every year we have a new biography of some Revolutionary worthy, in which his brave deeds are chronicled, the battles of Brandywine and Germantown are fought over again, and